CENTER FOR POLICY STUDIES

VLADISLAV TODOROV

# Terror and Governance

2004

ANTI-AMERICANISM WORKING PAPERS

CENTER FOR POLICY STUDIES
CENTRAL EUROPEAN UNIVERSITY
Nádor utca 9
H–1051 Budapest, Hungary

cps@ceu.hu
http://www.ceu.hu/cps

Vladislav Todorov
Department of Slavic Languages and Literatures
University of Pennsylvania
745 Williams Hall, 255 S 36th St.
Philadelphia, PA 19104-6305, USA
vtodorov@sas.upenn.edu

2004

Typesetting • Tamás Dombos

## CONTENTS

> The true felicity of ruler and subjects reaches perfection when all enjoy that tranquility of spirit, which comes from an inner assurance of security. This is the real political freedom of a nation. Then everyone is free to do what is to be desired, and no one compels anyone to do what is not to be desired.
>
> Fonvizin

## 1. The Present-Day Predicament

Terrorism presents the greatest threat to any form of organized government and civil society. Acts of terrorism induce a primal, utterly disorganizing fear, which could alter instantaneously and lastingly behaviors of entire nations. This fear erodes the fabric of civility. Terror-stricken people cannot function as citizens. Terrorism does not only impact the public sentiments but it could trigger serious societal mutations. Therefore, the common wisdom says, it becomes essential for the governments to respond swiftly and decisively in order to arrest the civility-degrading terror.

In times of terror, governments seek safety in revamping and reorganizing their own institutions. They reinvent their systems of control and policing in an effort to contain the fear and straitjacket its source. Nevertheless, a general discontent could soon emerge as any institutional enhancement of collective safety translates directly into revising and even violating of individual freedoms.

Arguably, in a modern society that faces a societal threat of this severity and frantic militancy, civil liberties may not be advantageous for the common good anymore, as their unrelenting observance might cause a general vulnerability. This circumstance alone makes terrorism extremely perilous for all governments that recognize the inalienability of civil rights and liberties. Facing a terrorist threat, these governments become flawed by their own constitutional system, by their very nature of being modern, civil, and open. Thus, urgent revisions and radical corrections of principles may become inevitable in the process of reinforcing general safeguard, which, in turn, could lead to a departure from the founding premise of a nation.

The very dilemma of "collective safety versus civil liberties" ties up a knot—a Gordian knot that cannot be undone once tied. In an effort to cut that knot, governments declare wars on terrorism while operating under the assumption that sufficient force exacted with precision should resolve any problem. Notwithstanding, "war" on terrorism implies campaigning against its militant structures. This war cannot engage and successfully eliminate cultural, religious, social, economic, or political basis of terrorism, as this type of threat is never baseless. It is fair to say that a war would rather solidify the "human base" of terror and thus tighten the knot even stronger. Moreover, while waging wars on terrorism and, at the same time, instituting general safeguard, modern polities wind up revising their founding codes and reinventing their legal systems.

The history of the last two centuries shows that many modern systems of governance had changed repeatedly while seeking to untie the knot. Since its emergence in 19th century Russia, organized terrorism forces governments into developing new agencies and branches of state that are set on a public mission to devise and implement extraordinary policies, which invariably change these governments' nature. Nevertheless, regimes of reinforced safeguard that restrict civil liberties have proven simply ineffective with regard to the main task—the eradication of terrorism, as they cannot remove but rather bolster the basis of any domestically grown terrorism. Finally, the society is put to test as a society when it hits the threshold where the intolerance toward any further enforcement of collective safety suppresses the intolerance toward the threat that causes it.

Normally, governments that face terrorist threat promulgate aggressive reforming while the media feeds fear to the public in order to rally the citizenry behind them. Notwithstanding, good students of

history would argue that the ultimate danger of terrorism could very well hide in the counterterror reforms, as they could damage the body politic irreparably. Faced by a faceless and stateless enemy, the modern powers find themselves caught up in a vicious circle or rather in an uncontrollable spiraling into some unknown condition.

History shows that a tight homeland safeguard can straitjacket the devils of terrorism only temporarily. It is commonly advocated that in order to dispel them for good, we need to reengineer their social base—the communities that harbor and cherish them. Therefore, governments battered by waves of terror engage in nation-class-community building in an effort to render self-contained the alienated and rebellious social elements. Historically speaking the counterterror effort has been consistently twofold—the implementation of a system of general safeguard and universal policing that would destroy the terror networks as well as social engineering that would reform their social base.

How do we find the way out of the terror-land and most importantly, what kind of a nation we will become while walking out of it? Do we need to take yet another lesson of history in order to answer this question?

## 2. The Lesson of History

Seemingly, in times of such troubles, the politicians do not appear prone to ask history for answers, as if our present is such violent interruption of our past, so unusual and unprecedented that it invalidates history. Nevertheless, if not explicit answers history certainly presents us with telling enactments of various situations—for instance the political history of the late imperial Russia. At the time, terror and counter-terror methods were so thoroughly developed and experimentally tested that we find there a universal laboratory of sorts where our present-day predicaments appear to have been "invented." The more we examine this particular moment of history, the stronger becomes the conviction that today we find ourselves caught up in a mere replay of what had played out already a century ago.

The assassination of the Tsar Alexander II in 1881, which "crowned" a long string of attempts on his life, triggered a massive overreaction on the part of the government. In fact, the counterterror reforms and policies subsequently put in place exacerbated the situation even further and effectively radicalized the basis of terrorism. Special regimes of safeguard were established. The police had to issue "certificates of trustworthiness" to those who aspired to enroll in universities or work in the administration. Russia became an accomplished Police State characterized by severe marginalization of the law and a marked shift of judiciary prerogatives to the Ministry of Interior. The new system of safeguard bolstered the regulatory-administrative initiative of the executive branch in all matters of private and public life. The authorities resorted to intrusive policing, to courts marshal, and tribunals as the main, if not the only instruments of governance. But to no avail, as the networks of terror thrived on the social and political aggravation that the system safeguard had created. The failing policies of universal safety prompted the Moscow secret police to engage in experimental social engineering, the effects of which could challenge the constructive premises of any governance set on a counterterror mission. The effects, I will argue, were daunting. But before I go any further with the presentation of this bold experiment, I need to elucidate its ideological basis, as it could constitute the basis of any other counterterror initiative of the same nature and, as such, produce a similar effect. We can call it—the Frankenstein effect.

## 2.1 "In the Name of the People"

Organized terrorism emerges in the 19th century as an instrument available to nations, ethnic minorities, religious communities, and oppressed classes who seek to assert in a militant way their unrecognized differences or unacknowledged existence. Pariahs who strive to change political systems and policies to their own advantage, to raise the consciousness of their own people and promote their own identity often use the instrument of terrorism and organized militancy when confronted by oppressive, hostile, or unresponsive governments.

The terrorists act "in the name of the people" while seeking to reverse the economy of fear, that is, to make the government fear "the people." Thus, identifying who are the people that they claim to stand for is the sine qua non of any terrorist formation. In order to cope with the primal lack of legitimate mandate to act in the name of any people, the terrorists need to define and mobilize their own social base, gain its support and recognition. That is why terrorists often engage in community development, social work, and "diffusion of knowledge among the people," in order to become the one and only controlling authority for them.

Terrorists are self-appointed dark apostles who act in the name of the inert masses. The bomb, they maintain, speaks for the silenced and they must mandate its explosion. The people should recognize that this is their own voice that roars through the destruction.

Terrorists believe that the very application of violent force is rehabilitating as it disorganizes the system of oppression and vents the peoples' anger. In 1881, the year of the Russian Tsar's assassination, Tkachov, a red-hot ideologue of terror, published an article called "Terrorism as the only way of moral and social revival of Russia." There he wrote as follows: "Revolutionary terrorism is not only the most adequate and practical way of disorganizing the existing police-bureaucratic state, moreover it is uniquely real way for the moral rebirth of the enslaved subject into a person-citizen." (Istoria Terrorizma, 153-154.) He knew that the French citizen was born and tempered in revolutionary terror.

The social base is the root system of the terrorist networks, which, if severed or reengineered, could cause their extinction. This constitutes the only vulnerability of terrorism, its doom—to become baseless.

## 2.2 Steal Their Base

Russian revolutionary terrorists identified the city workers as their proper social base in the late 1870s after their grandioso failure to mobilize the masses for revolution in a populist campaign known as "going to the people." At the time, they believed that without directly engaging the Russian people, the political revolution couldn't take place. Their campaign derailed in mass arrests as the people routinely tipped the police. Subsequently, the proponents of terrorist methods gained prominence, as they argued that without violently disorganizing the system of governance that contained and dulled these masses, nothing could possibly turn them into a revolutionary force. Therefore, not the obscure Russian masses, but the city workers were identified as that particularly alienated group, which the revolutionary terrorists had to approach and structure into a solid social base.

After two decades of counterproductive, intrusive safeguard that followed the assassination of the Tsar, the Moscow counterterror police (Okhrana) came to a historical realization—terrorism would whither away only if rendered baseless. Thus, they took it upon themselves to remobilize the Russian city workers by structuring them into an official, police-guided, and self-contained class, which was expected to develop gradually into an independent estate with its own system of political and public representation. This experiment became known as "police socialism."

Sergei Zubatov, the chief of Moscow Okhrana at the time, takes all the credit for masterminding and conducting the experiment. He came to believe that the revolutionary spirit would never die and the underground would never cave in if the social base of its very existence constituted a vital part of the body politic. Nonetheless, he would argue, terrorism could be crippled, rendered inapt to inflict any serious damage if it had to lose its social ground. Thus, Zubatov in effect launched the official labor movement in Russia that had to engage the workers in a governable "proletarian pursuit of happiness." For a short period of time, he placed the proletarians under police patronage in a well-planned effort to voice their interests in the public domain and render their claims officially negotiable. His initiative exemplifies the kind of economic and social constructivism embedded in the original agenda of modern policing as we see it defined in Catherine the Great *Nakaz* and *Zertsalo*—two constituent documents of the Russian Enlightenment that had adopted the main postulates of German Polizeiwisenshaft and Cameralism.

Although it was short-lived (from 1901 to 1903), the experiment engineered and motioned forward for the new dawning century a notable structure known as the Soviet—the organ of working class representation and self-government that was destined to become the governing body of the Bolshevik State. Moreover, Zubatov spirited the experimental creation of yet another bold structure—the independent Jewish labor party in the city of Minsk—in an effort to splinter the existing Jewish revolutionary labor movement. He thought that it would be beneficial for both the society at large and the Jewish community in particular if the police could redefine the ultimate causes of the Jews by diverting their movement from political revolution toward a moderate ethnic-cultural patriotism. By supervising the creation and the activities of this new party, Zubatov intended to engage the Jewish toilers in a police-guided Zionism and ultimately turn them into a self-contained nationality that recognizes the political absolute of the Tsar—yet another scandal for the Russian anti-Semitic elites that supported forced russification of the national minorities. Notably, the first congress of the Russian Zionists met in Minsk thanks to his secret assistance (Karasilk, 40.)

Before we study more closely the doctrine of "police socialism," we need to outline the philosophical-political tradition that defined its premise and, in a certain way, conditioned its long-lasting historical implications.

### 2.3 Of the Police Happiness of Nations

> The purpose of the police is everything that has to do with maintaining and augmenting the happiness of the citizens, *omnium et singulorum*.
>
> Von Hohental, Liber de Politia, 1776.

The enlightened postulate of good and efficient governance is found in the compendiums produced by various French and German 18th century schools of political-economic thought. They promulgate that that the main object of police is the cultivation and procurement of a collectively shared sentiment of happiness and wellbeing. Effective policing invents instruments of social engineering that can create subjects who in good will do what they ought and thus become apt for happiness. The immediate task of modern policing is to make subjects identify their personal goals with the causes of government, which makes the populace perceive of the officially administered order as a prerequisite for a prosperous life. Proper policing conditions the reflexes in a body politic and thus secures routine civility and tranquility in its diverse composition. Thus, the well-policed state is identified as the dominion of happiness.

Nicholas De LaMare, for instance, stresses that the sole purpose of the police is to lead man to the utmost happiness to be enjoyed on the earth (Foucault, Omnes et Singulatim 250). Catherine the Great closely studied his "Treatise on Police" (1722) when She composed her *Zertsalo* (Chapter 41 of a legal document on police entitled *Ustav Blagochiniia ili Politseiskoi* or Statute of Decorum publicized in 1782.) Her Majesty systematically borrowed the postulates of modern policemanship from the Enlightened West in order to institute in feudal Russia an efficient system of civility.

German Polizeiwissenschaft (Police Science) and Cameralism became major sources of the new techniques of civil and economically beneficial subjection. The two doctrines developed as integral parts of the new methods of governance that Friedrich Wilhelm I introduced after the Thirty Years War. In 1727, he instituted a chair for "Oeconomie, Policey und Kammer-Sachen" at the University of Hale. Thus, the academic subject of cameralism was established that soon developed into an independent discipline providing instruction for future state officials (Tribe, Strategies 8). Police Sciences were taught in the German universities, especially in Goettingen where were trained those statesmen who later were assigned the task of implementing the reforms under Catherine the Great.

According to these new sciences, modern police should seek to enhance the sentiment of happiness among the subjects making them genuinely desire and indulgently assimilate public authority. It equates individual happiness with the might of the state. It views the dominion as an *oeconomy* (household or husbandry). For the first time economy is defined academically and administratively as an autonomous base of sovereignty and thus it becomes a political category. Hence, modern policing assigns the entire mass of the population to an economically efficient life. In this new political system of happiness, the distinction between governance by law and governance by decree and directive fades out (Gordon 10-12). In this respect, the modern police exercises principal regulatory sanction, not adjudicative but rather administrative.

In the process of its modernization, Russian political economy adopted two contrasting doctrines of achieving general civility and wellbeing—those of physiocracy and cameralism. The former teaches minimum administrative intervention in the growth of wealth that is mainly secured by unregulated land cultivation and only dependant on the natural law. The latter advocated categorical governmentalization and politicization of the economy in all of its components—production, commerce, consumption, etc.—that procure general happiness and wellbeing.

Cameralism seeks to stimulate in a guided way the happiness of nations while maintaining a well-ordered commonwealth and well-regulated acquisition of public good by means of an elaborate system of administrative policing. It adopts a social-constructivist approach that treats society as field of scientific policing, social engineering, and economic rationalizations. Contrastingly, the natural-organic vision of physiocracy treats society as an entity that enjoys natural (not constructively policed) integrity. It enjoys a self-regulated economy managed through legislative codification and not administrative regulation.

Cameralism derives its meaning from Latin "camera" that initially designated the princely palace and later the place of central administration over dominions. It advocates constructive policing and envisions the creation of an integral bureaucratic cadre of administration. Cameralism consists of two subdivisions—*Oeconomie*, that teaches individual happiness and wellbeing, and *Polizei* that teaches general happiness and wellbeing. The latter studies productive house-holding and husbandry, while the former studies the civil order and tranquility as prerequisites for public happiness. Both disciplines entail an administrative science of general wellbeing. This science instructs rulers and officials how to regulate national prosperity as the chief resource of their might. Therefore, good government is defined as an efficient administration of happiness that generates the might of state.

In fact, the expansion of the Smithian political economy of self-regulation and minimal government and the impact that it had on the social sciences caused the academic decline of all

regulatory and administrative disciplines. Thus by the 1820s the discipline of cameralism disappeared from the scene (Strategies 24-25). Nonetheless, it is its doctrine that provides conceptual ground for the experimental "police socialism."

### 2.4 Police Socialism: Soviets in the Making

> This art of directing the activities of the masses on the basis of organized self-government is here applied for the first time on Russian soil.
>
> Trotsky (Anthology, 53)

In his youth, Zubatov became a disciple of the Russian nihilist Pisarev and formed a circle of students in his Moscow gymnasium. Later, he befriended established terrorists such as Morozov (a member of the executive committee of People's Will) and Gotz (one of the founders of the SR Party) while managing a bookstore owned by his future wife through which they supplied the underground with illegal literature. Consequently, Moscow Okhrana arrested him and recruited him as an informant. After years of undercover work, in 1890s he was appointed as assistant chief of police. Zubatov took it upon himself to modernize the police work introducing innovative techniques of interrogation and recruitment, photographic file system of registration of the political suspects. Okhrana operatives had to go through a special training of undercover clandestine work that also involved instruction in conspiratorial methods, subversive activities, and revolutionary mentality. He created a special rapid-reaction unit—the "flying squadron"—ready to engage the enemy wherever it became active. He avoided mass arrests as they were causing public intolerance and aggravation. He would take into custody only the key figures, try to convert them and release them for "breeding purposes." He was a very convincing speaker, as he truly believed in the causes of his work, which secured him a great success in converting and recruiting many revolutionaries putting them on police payroll. During his tenure, his office provided well-acknowledged examples of innovative and effective police work. Thus, in 1896 at the age of thirty-two, Zubatov was appointed Chief of Moscow Okhrana.

During the period of his own conversion and later rising as a highly celebrated ideologue of constructive policing, he had reformed his political convictions and now promulgated the peculiar idea of a socialist monarchy where Tsar and people formed inalienable unity (Schneiderman, Sergei Zubatov 49-59).

Unlike Bismarck, Zubatov did not believe in legislating as a way to govern the working class. He pushed for police administrative methods instead. For him the working class had to be rendered official without involving any legal process. He intended to use the press as proper medium that could create and maintain an official image of the working class in the public domain. He knew that any form of legalization would create sovereign rights and thus basis for institutional independence of the proletarian organizations and their leadership. The process of their creation and the mode of their existence had to depend entirely on the methods of administrative policing. They had to be official, nevertheless not legislatively enacted bodies in order to be instrumental for the effective and lasting containment of the working class.

Zubatov saw the creation of the official labor movement as carried out in gradual police-regulatory steps. Thus, on April 8, 1898, Zubatov drafted a memorandum regarding the official regulation of the labor movements and the relations between workers and factory owners. The real threat to the Russian government, he saw coming from the systematic effort of the radical intelligentsia to mobilize the working class for revolution:

> "The history of the revolutionary movement has shown that the intelligentsia by itself has insufficient forces for a struggle against the government even if by chance it is

> armed with explosives … having united the workers to antigovernment undertakings, it (the social-democratic movement) has at its disposal such a mass force that the government must seriously take into account." (Schneiderman 63).

According to the report, the danger of this happening was conditioned by the situation in the factories that had put the workers in a severely disadvantaged position. In this respect, an urgent involvement of the police in the process of the exploitation had become necessary:

> "The relationship between employers and workers…cannot avoid strict police surveillance." (65).

General Trepov, the chief of Moscow police, presented this document to the Moscow Governor-General Grand Duke Sergei Aleksandrovich and secured his approval. On November 11, 1901, the first official organization of the Moscow workers was created with a special instruction signed by Trepov. In March 1902 this organization became known as "The Soviet of Workers of the City of Moscow." Its overriding purpose was the creation of an authoritative organ of coordination and representation of the working class—a General Soviet. The idea was commonly regarded as a fascinating novelty (Palat 91-92; Korelin, Krakh 120).

> "It was an entirely novel creation; and it is no accident of history that the Autocracy, like its triumphant opponent subsequently, hit upon the very word sovet , customarily spelled soviet, to denote the undifferentiated class and political organization of the workers of a city" (Palat 93).

The first Soviet took charge of a complex program developed with the collaboration of the liberal faculty of the Moscow University who formulated the scientific, historical, and ideological basis of the experiment. Zubatov needed to engaged the liberally minded moderate learned community as a replacement for the revolutionary intelligentsia that was seeking aggressively to imbue the toiling masses with militant subversive class-consciousness. The experiment involved spiritual enlightenment of the workingmen, consciousness-raising that recognized the supremacy of the national values, and cultural recreation during leisure time. Thus, the Soviet was expected to know about, regulate, and aid the life of the working class in all of its professional, public, and private aspects. Ideally, the Soviet had to render the class self-contained and impregnable for terrorists.

The Soviet was experimentally created as a representative body—a rudimentary proletarian self-government—with a police-defined mandate and function. Nevertheless, its ultimate objective was to develop an autonomous estate out of a system of soviets, which were seen as transitional forms. Lev Tikhomirov, a former high-ranking terrorist now converted ideologue of the "police socialism," advocated that this estate had to comprise communes of workers and peasants, and had to enjoy a limited independence and elective bodies of self-government of *zemstvo* type (Krakh 131; Palat 121-122).

The experiment was abolished, but not because it proved to be ineffective, right to the contrary, it took off very strongly and enjoyed a great popularity among the workers, who did not doubt Zubatov's endeavors to ease the severity of their exploitation. The reason was too trivial—it had deepened the institutional conflict between the Ministry of Finance and the Ministry of Interior, two branches of government that at the time served two opposing agendas. The latter advocated the necessity of officially recognized system for negotiating class differences and formal-contractual regulation of the relations between workers and factory owners as the only way to socially alienate and eradicate terrorism in Russia. Contrastingly, the former was pushing aggressively for unregulated expansion of capitalism, minimal interference, traditional masterly subordination in the work place and paternal care of the employers for the needs of the workers as the only way to eradicate the

economic backwardness of Russia. The antagonism grew so vehement and the intolerance against the experiment became so overwhelming that the Interior Minister Plehve had to transfer Zubatov from Moscow to St. Petersburg while blocking all efforts of expanding the practices of "police socialism" into the capital city. In August 1903, Zubatov was dismissed from service and later exiled in Vladimir (Korelin, Russkii 58). It was during dinner when he learned about the abdication of the Tsar. He left the room and shot himself.

In order to frame the working class in a system of officially regulated civility, the police had to free it from both the militant underground and the patriarchal yoke in the factories. Thus, "police socialism" conflicted with the essential interests and methods of both the industrialists and their lobbies and the revolutionary underground whose *reason d'etre* was to act in the name of the proletariat.

In a note dated March 4, 1902 Zubatov defined his purpose—to break the labor mass into cells and influence their leadership. Thus, the police could effectively contain their spontaneity and predilection for struggle (Korelin, Krakh 121). Notably, in the same year, Lenin drafted his seminal work "What is to Be Done?" In it, he developed the underground doctrine of class struggle in an urgent effort to counter the expanding influence of the "police socialism." Lenin aggressively promulgated that only party-minded political conspiracy of professional revolutionaries would be the right method of capturing and transforming the proletarian spontaneity into an effective force. Any official organizing and unionizing, he claimed, was a police stratagem that could have only a degrading effect on the movement. The pamphlet called for a general revamping of the underground toward increasingly professionalized activism.

Arguably, the experiment had challenged and thus utterly radicalized both the prevalent policies of autocratic governance and the methods of revolution, which created an unprecedented historical-political dynamics in the country.

### 2.5 The Runaway Soviet

Notably, the police experiment did not produce trade unions but soviets instead. When the minister of interior inquired about the legal basis for the creation of the "trade unions," general Trepov, a strong supporter of the experiment, as already noted, made the following remark:

> "In fact, there exists no Union in Moscow, as for the Soviet of workers approved by me, it is an exclusively original phenomenon, because this particular Soviet, in fact has no corresponding to its own principle organized society of workers" (Korelin, Krakh 120).

The fate of pioneering processes and initiatives could become utterly ironic. The story of the Soviet did not and could not end with its abrupt abrogation. On January 9, 1905, a peaceful workers' demonstration took the streets of St. Petersburg to carry a petition to the Tsar. In front of the Winter Palace, the guards started shooting at the workers and violently dispersed them. This day became known as the Bloody Sunday—the day that signaled the Russian revolution of 1905. Father Gapon led the procession being the head of the Assembly of Russian Factory Workers of St. Petersburg and, confessedly, one of the most ardent Zubatov's epigones.

Father Gapon started the organized labor movement in the capital city in 1903 clearly inspired by the Moscow experiment. In September of the same year, he wrote Zubatov as follows:

> "We are not forgetting you, our teacher—we remember … we are not concealing the fact that the idea of a special kind of labor movement is your idea, but we emphasize that our connection with the police is now broken (which is true), that our cause is

> just and aboveboard, and that the police can only check on us but not keep us on a leash." (Schwarz, 272)

The result of the abovementioned strives for independence was the Assembly of Russian Factory Workers of St. Petersburg, created of on February 15, 1904 when its statute was officially approved. In many respects, the Assembly resembled the Moscow Soviet being a single unified organ of proletarian representation operating under official supervision. Nevertheless, its statute was much more explicit and detailed with regard to its prerogatives and responsibilities to provide lawful representation of and legitimate leadership to the working class. By the beginning of 1905, the Assembly had already more then ten thousand members organized in eleven regional sections. Both organs—the Moscow Soviet and the Petersburg Assembly—shared structural characteristics with the revolutionary soviets (Korelin, Krakh 141; Palat 110-111). Gapon's contribution to the original Zubatov's initiative was the swift shift from regulatory police socialism to mass militancy, all within the same organization (Palat 134-135).

The Bloody Sunday triggered a chain reaction. In the aftermath of the event, the government appointed a special commission chaired by Senator Shidlovskii to investigate the reasons for the workers' unrest in the capital city, study the nature of their needs and demands, and recommend appropriate actions. In addition to governmental officials and factory owners, the commission included a group of worker's deputies. In order to secure proportionate representation of all major industrial sectors in the city, the workers were instructed to select voters, who, for their part, had to elect the representatives of the working class to the commission. As a result, 372 voters designated 50 deputies to the commission, each of them representing 500 workers. The commission, which was soon dismissed, nevertheless had a serious impact on the emerging culture of working-class consciousness-raising and mobilization around elective bodies with certain public mandate.

Thus, by actively promoting working class elective representation, Shidlovskii Commission, after the Moscow Soviet and St. Petersburg Assembly, contributed to the emergence of the "genuinely" revolutionary October Soviet in the fall of the same year. One can speculate that by the fall of 1905, the process that had started in 1901 established a practice for creation of deputized bodies of proletarian self-government in a country reigned by the Spirit and the Letter of Orthodox-Autocratic fundamentalism.

A clear continuity of personnel can be established if one takes into account the fact that certain electors to the commission later became deputies to the October Soviet. (Khrustalev-Nosar', Palat 131-132). Miliukov, for instance, remembers how Khrustalev, one of the workers' deputies who had landed on the Commission, transferred his mandate to an intellectual, a young lawyer by the name of Nosar' who soon after that was banished from the capital. Nevertheless, in October 1905, the same person reemerged on the political scene as the leader of the "first" Soviet (Miliukov 78).

In "The Unknown Revolution," Voline, an outspoken revolutionary and anarchist, points out that Nosar' was the material link between the Gaponite Assembly, Shidlovskii Commission, and the October Soviet since he was the initiator of the very first, the unrecognized Soviet.

"One evening"—Voline remembers—"about eight days after January 9, someone knocked at the door of my room. I was alone. A young man came in: "I'm George Nosar', a legal clerk. I'll get to the reason of my visit. On January 8, I listened to your reading of the petition. I'm a revolutionary ... but I don't have any acquaintances among workers. On the other hand, I have extensive contacts with circles of bourgeois liberals who oppose the regime. So I have an Idea" (97).

Thus, Voline dates the creation of the first Petersburg Soviet not in October but in January or February, immediately after the Bloody Sunday but before the convocation of the Shidlovskii Commission. He remembers how the very concept of the Soviet as a "permanent social assembly of workers" originated during an evening gathering of workers-activists at his house. At this event,

Nosar' was offered the leading post in the organization and was given a workers' card of a factory delegate by the name of Khrustalev. At the first meeting of the factory delegates, Nosar' was nominated for the position and thus became president of the first Petersburg Soviet. Notably, in this capacity he entered the Shidlovskii Commission. Thus, the first Petersburg Soviet, according to Voline, was created earlier in1905 as an immediate consequence of the Bloody Sunday. Soon after that, it dissolved itself into the Shidlovskii Commission to be reinstated later in October by this same Nosar' when it resumed its public function (Voline 91-101).

Trotsky—commonly celebrated as the "first" true chairman of the "first" Soviet—remembers Nosar' as an "accidental figure in the revolution, representing an intermediate stage between Gapon and the Social Democracy (Trotsky My Life, 182). Many workers and revolutionary activists while remembering the turbulent 1905 acknowledge the distinct evolution of the structures of proletarian representation from the Gaponite Assembly, through the Shidlovskii Commission, to the October—the Trotsky's—Soviet. The Mensheviks and the liberally minded people perceived of the October Soviet as an organ of "revolutionary self-government" (Miliukov 78). In 1905, Lenin himself hailed the shift of the proletarian movement from purely economic and unionist to political revolutionary grounds while making a specific note that the working class had outgrown its "Zubatovist jacket."

Finally, by October 1905, the process of creating social, political, organizational as well as behavioral basis for proletarian self-government had completed itself. Resolutely, Trotsky ceased the moment and captured its organ. Obviously, it was not difficult for him to depose Nosar'—a man stricken by vanity, a poseur, who was never able to resolve a single issue of principle (Sverchkov 182). This could qualify for a micro coup with historical consequences. Now, imbued with the spirit of subversion the very image of the Soviet will become "ingrained in the consciousness of the workingmen as the first prerequisite to revolutionary action of the masses" (Trotsky, Anthology 55-56).

Neither a trade union nor a party, the Soviet was designed as a representative and deliberative body of proletarian self-government. Trotsky, the new ideologue and chairman of the Soviet, defines its organizational principle as follows: "... the Soviet was not formed on the basis of a group of persons holding the same political opinions (like a political party or conspiratorial organization), but on the basis of electoral representation (like Duma or Zemstvo) ... a representative body whose further activities were to be determined by the subsequent collective decisions of its members."(Palat 128-129)

In the fall of 1906, the Soviet deputies were charged with the planning of an insurrection. During the trial proceedings, Trotsky made a clear remark to the prosecutor emphasizing the elective nature of the Soviet versus a league of like-minded revolutionaries. Its nature of a nonpartisan deputized body of proletarian self-government was crucial to him.

The original goals of the Soviet as a public organ of working-class self-government were redefined after Trotsky steered it in the revolutionary underground. Now, the Soviet was set on a new subversive mission: "to create conditions for disorganizing the government, for "anarchy" ... for revolutionary conflict." (Trotsky, Anthology 55-56).

Finally, by 1907 the Russian government had completely lost not only control over, but sight of the organ of working-class representation. Yet, it will take almost a decade for the Soviets to claim the whole power in Russia.

### 2.6 The New Frankenstein

By its enlightened eighteen-century postulate, the modern police act as a creative force rather than as an enforcer. In this respect, the "police socialism" provides a bold evidence of genuinely

programmatic, regulatory governance and police constructivism. Spirited by this postulate, Zubatov invented the Soviet in a calculated effort to steal and reinvent the social base of the terrorists. Ironically, he soon lost control over his creation as it was "stolen" by the revolutionaries and plunged into the underground.

Zubatov—the New Doctor Frankenstein—engineered the Soviet as a non-party-partisan and non-union-professional structure of proletarian self-containment. The political process in the country, which had become utterly volatile after the experiment, engaged this structure in a series of dynamic transformations until finally the Bolshevik revolution instituted it as the governing body of the proletarian sovereignty.

The Soviet constitutes a unique contribution not only to the working-class organizations existing in Europe at the time of the experiment, but more importantly, to the institutional formation of the future proletarian body politic. Originally created in 1901 as a police instrument for containing the working class, the Soviet reemerged in the fall of 1905 in St. Petersburg and soon after that was high-jacked and once again reengineered to become the main vehicle of the political revolution. In the summer of 1917, we find an entire system of Soviets of the Workers' and the Solders' Deputies functioning already as a parallel government in Russia. History had taken staggering turns.

Following the party directives, the newly born soviet historiography buried the umbilical cord of the proletarian governmentality in a sea of ideological fallacy, lest the tsarist secret police claim it as its own invention.

After the revolution, the Soviets themselves engaged in grandioso campaigns of social engineering and multi-nation building while launching a campaign of total industrialization and collectivization of the country as they sought to mass-produce, purify, and secure an unlimited supply of their own social base—the working class.

Nevertheless, the brave new world of the Soviets added no distinctly original quality to the ethos of constructivist policing that was imported in Russia by Peter the Great and perfected by Catherine the Great—the main architects of Russian modernity. A special affinity exists between the police practices, institution-building, and social-programming of both Russian Imperial and Soviet authoritarian Regimes that promulgated one cause—provisioning for a happy population that integrates many national minorities on the basis of a commonly shared prosperity under an efficient government.

The Red terror that ensued after the revolution resorted to universally executed and excessively theatricalized techniques of discipline and regulation, many of which were already invented and tested in alternative, White regimes of terror. Originally, the Red terror had to provide the cathartic means, not the tragic ends of the Soviet disciplinary power. The Red terror had its communist design as it served an utopian vision of ultimate "condensation," and "concentration" of the entire mass of the population into a singularly aggregated and utterly agitated, happily toiling Red Leviathan.

In its present form, terrorism was born with the dawn of modernity and will stay until it survives. Terrorism is part of the modern condition and thus it is indestructible. In one form or another, it will exist as long as this condition perseveres globally or locally. Reforming will not destroy it. Nevertheless, cunning policing could degrade it, render it inapt, and keep it in a state of chronic incapacitation, quietly! This is the quiet front and it should be kept quiet.

# APPENDIX

## Leninist Constitution of the RSFSR, 1918

(Adopted by the Fifth All-Russia Congress of Soviets)

Article 1. Russia is hereby proclaimed a Republic of Soviets of Workers', Soldiers' and Peasants' Deputies. All power, centrally and locally, is vested in these Soviets.

## Stalinist Constitution of the USSR, 1936

Article 1. The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics is a socialist state of workers and peasants.

Article 2. The Soviets of Working People's Deputies, which grew and attained strength as a result of the overthrow of the landlords and capitalists and the achievement of the dictatorship of the proletariat, constitute the political foundation of the USSR.

Article 3. In the USSR, all power belongs to the working people of town and country as represented by the Soviets of Working People's Deputies.

## Brezhnevist Constitution of the USSR, 1977

Article 1. The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics is a socialist state of the whole people, expressing the will and interests of the workers, peasants, and intelligentsia, the working people of all the nations and nationalities of the country.

Article 2. All power in the USSR belongs to the people.

The people exercise state power through Soviets of People's Deputies, which constitute the political foundation of the USSR.

All other state bodies are under the control of, and accountable to, the Soviets of People's Deputies.

## REFERENCES


Alekseev, A. A. "Promyshlennost'." *Russkaia rech'* 4 (1972): 133-134.

Alexander, John. "Catherine the Great and Public Health. *Journal of the History of Medicine and Allied Sciences* 36 (1981): 185-204.

Anweiler, O., *The Soviets: The Russian Workers, Peasants, and Soldiers Councils, 1905-1921*. New York: Pantheon Books, 1974.

Catharine the Great. *Instruction (Nakaz) to the Legislative Commission, 1767*. Ed. and transl. Paul Dukes. Vol. 2. Newtonville: Oriental Research Partners, 1977.

Chaadaev, Ia. *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii i izbrannye pisma*. 2 vols. Moscow: Nauka, 1991.

Chapman, Brian. *Police State*. New York: Praeger Publishers, 1970.

Daly, Jonathan. "The Security Police and Politics in Late Imperial Russia." *Russia under the Last Tsar*. Ed. Anna Geifman. Blackwell Publishers, 1999.

Dukes, Paul. *Introduction. Catharine the Great's Instruction (Nakaz) to the Legislative Commission, 1767*. Ed. and transl. Paul Dukes. Vol. 2. Newtonville: Oriental Research Partners, 1977.

Fonvizin, Denis. *The Political and Legal Writings of Denis Fonvizin*. Ed. and transl. Walter Gleason. Ann Arbor: Ardis Publishers, 1985.

Foucault, M. "Governmentality." *The Foucault Effect: Studies in Governmentality*. Ed. G. Burchell, C. Gordon and P. Miller. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1991. 87-104.

Foucault, M. "Omnes et Singulatim: Towards a Criticism of 'Political Reason'." *The Tanner Lectures on Human Values*, Vol. 2. Salt Lake City: U of Utah P, 1981. 223-254.

Gordon, Colin. "Governmental Rationality: An Introduction." *The Foucault Effect: Studies in Governmentality.* Ed. G. Burchell, C. Gordon and P. Miller. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1991. 1-51.

Griffiths, D. M. "Eighteenth-Century Perceptions of Beckwardness: Projects for the Creation of a Third Estate in Catherinean Russia." *Canadian-American Slavic Studies* Vol. 13. 4 (1979): 452-472.

Grigor'ev, Vladimir, "Zertsalo upravy blagochinia." *Russkii istoricheskii zhurnal* 3-4 (1917): 73-103.

Hudson, H. D. "Urban Estate Engineering in Eighteenthe-Century Russia: Catherine the Great and the Elusive Meschanstvo." *Canadian-American Slavic Studies* Vol. 18. 4 (1984): 393-410.

*Istoriia terrorizma v Rossii*. Feniks, 1996. 153-154.

Karasik, Theodore, "The Early Years of Zubatov's Experiment in Police-Supported Socialism in Late Imperial Russia." *UCLA Historical Journal* ? (……): 27-46.

Khrustalev-Nosar', G. "Istoriia SovetaRabochikh Deputatov (do 26-go noiabria 1905 g.)" in *Istoriia Soveta Rabochikh Deputatov g. S.-Peterburga*. Petersburg: Knigoizdatel'stvo N. Glagoleva. 1906. 45-169.

Korelin, A. P. "Krakh ideologii "politseiskogo sotsialisma" v tsarskoi Rossii." *Istoricheskie Zapiski* 92 (1973): 109-152.

Korelin, A. P. "Russkii "Politseiskii sotsialism" (zubatovshchina)" *Voprosy Istorii* 10(1968): 41-58.

Lemke, M. *Nikolaevskie zhandarmy i literatura 1826-1855 gg*. Peterburg, 1909.

Lenin, "What Is to Be Done?" *The Lenin Anthology*. Ed. Robert C. Tucker. New York: Norton, 1975. 12-114.

Lincoln, Bruce. *Nicholas I: Emperor and Autocrat of all the Russias*. Bloomington: Indiana UP, 1980.

Lure, S. S. "Iz istorii dvortsovykh zagovorov v Rossii XVIII veka." *Voprosy istorii* 7 (1965): 214-218.

Malia, M. "What is the Intelligentsia?" *The Russian Intelligentsia*. Ed. Richard Pipes. New York: Columbia UP, 1961. 1-18.

Miliukov, P. *Political Memoirs 1905-1917*. Ann Arbor: U Michigan P, 1967.

Miliukov, P., ed. *History of Russia*. Vol. 2. New York: Funk and Wagnalls, 1968.

Montesquieu. *The Spirit of Laws*. Birmingham: Legal Classics Library, 1984.

Palat, Madhavan K. "Police Socialism in Tsarist Russia, 1900-1905." *Studies in History* vol. 2 1(1986): 71-136.

Pasquino, P. "Theatrum Politicum: The Genealogy of Capital--Police and the State of Prosperity." *The Foucault Effect: Studies in Governmentality*. Ed. G. Burchell, C. Gordon and P. Miller. Chicago: U of Chicago Press, 1991. 105-118.

Pipes, Richard. *Russia under the Old Regime*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1974.

Pospielovsky, Dimitry. *Russian Police Trade Unionism: Experiment or Provocation?* London: London School of Economics and Political Science, 1971.

Raeff, Marc. "Imperial Polices of Catherine II." *Major Problems in the History of Imperial Russia*. Ed. J. Cracraft. Lexington: D. C. Heath and Company, 1994. 234-243.

Raeff, Marc. *Political Ideas and Institutions in Imperial Russia*. Boulder: Westview Press, 1994.

Raeff, M., *The Well-Ordered Police State*. New Haven: Yale UP, 1983.

Riasanovsky, Nicholas. *Nicholas I and Official Nationality in Russia, 1825-1855*. Berkeley: U of California P, 1969.

Schneiderman, Jeremiah. *Sergei Zubatov and Revolutionary Marxism: The Struggle for the Working Class in Tsarist Russia*. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1976.

Schwarz, Solomon M. *The Russian Revolution of 1905: The Workers' Movement and the Formation of Bolshevism and Menshevism*. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1967.

Squire, Peter. *The Third Department: The Establishment and Practices of the Political Police in the Russia of Nicholas I.* Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1968.

Todorov, Vladislav. *Red Square. Black Square: Organon for Revolutionary Imagination*. Albany: SUNY Press, 1995.

Tribe, Keith, "Cameralism and the Science of Government." *Journal of Modern History* 56 (June 1984): 263-284.

Troitskii, S. M. "Dvorianskie proekty sozdaniia "tret'ego china." *Obshchestvo i gosudarstvo feodal'noi Rossii*. Ed. V. T. Pashuto. Moscow: Nauka, 1975. 226-236.

Trotsky, L., *The Age of Permanent Revolution: A Trotsky Anthology*. New York: Dell Publishing Co., 1964.

Trusova, N. S. *Nachalo pervoi russkoi revoliutsii: janvar'-mart 1905 goda*. Moscow: Izdatel'stvo Akademii Nauk SSSR. 1955.

Uspenskii, B. A. *Iz istorii russkogo literaturnogo iazyka XVIII--nachala XIX veka*. Moscow: Moscow University Press, 1985.

Voline, *The Unknown Revolution*. New York: Free Life Editions, 1975.

Witte, Count. *The Memoirs*. New York: M. E. Sharpe, 1990.

Zaionchkovskii, P. A. *Pravitel'stvennyi apparat samoderzhavnoi Rossii v XIX v*. Moscow: Mysl', 1978.

Zubatov, S. V. "Zubatovshchina." *Byloe* 4(1917): 157-178.

Zuckerman, Fredric S. *The Tsarist Secret Police in Russian Society, 1880-1917*. London: MacMillan Press, 1996.